

Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken

Food Security

Organisation	Date	Reporting Period
Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Bujumbura (Burundi)		2014

Activity		2014	Implemented by		Rio marker		Gender marker
Number	Name	Actual expenditure	Name Organisation	channel	mitigation/adaptation	significant/principal	significant/principal
25157	Energy supply study	3,510,000	Regideso	Government	Mitigation	Principal	Not applicable
25233	Contribution to fertiliser subsidy	5,000,000	Agriculture Ministry	Government	Not applicable	...	Significant
25672	Locally sourced school feeding	1,766,400	WFP	Multilateral organization	Not applicable	...	Not applicable
25799	Land registration Makamba	938,870	ZOA	NGO	Not applicable	...	Significant
24720 KIG regional	Catalist	for Burundi:	IFDC	NGO	Not applicable	...	Not applicable

Activity		2014	Implemented by		Rio marker		Gender marker
Number	Name	Actual expenditure	Name Organisation	channel	mitigation/adaptation	significant/principal	significant/principal
20415	Land registration	348,250	Swiss Development Cooperation SDC	...	Not applicable	...	Significant
20900	FORCE Microfinance	551,854	Finance Ministry	Government	Not applicable	...	Not applicable
24122	FARN Nutrition	463,982	GVC	NGO	Not applicable	...	Not applicable
24712	Enquete Agricole Nationale	308,725	BTC	...	Not applicable	...	Not applicable
24759	Fertiliser subsidy support project	1,254,031	IFDC	NGO	Adaptation	Significant	Significant
25030	Mtabila Refugee integration	192,000	UNDP	Multilateral organization	Not applicable	...	Significant
26412	integrated seed sector devloment	639,852	IFDC	NGO	Adaptation	Significant	Significant
25452	MAVC	600.000	ICCO-Terrafina	NGO	Adaptation	Significant	Significant
25927	ABIN	300.000	SPARK-BBIN	NGO	Adaptation	Significant	Significant
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...

Result Area 1	Increase in sustainable food production					
Result Question 1.1a: How large has the increase in food production been?	Production in 2014 has progressed on the national level. This is reflected in the increase of equivalent cereal measured by ENAB which rose from 1,700,000 to 1,836,682 cereal equivalent metric tonnes. The most important increase is in the rice and maize production with a respectively 14 and 11 % increase. Nevertheless, the number of months with satisfactory food availability is still very low. Food shortages at national level are estimated to remain around 30%. It should be noted that the national agricultural statistics are of low quality.					
	Baseline	**Target 2017**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Indicator 1: Production in metric tons cereal equivalents, country	1,700,000	1,910,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,836,682	ENAB
Indicator 2: number of farmers with increased production, country	0	600,000	0	0	157,500	IFDC - PANPNSEB project report
Indicator 3: Production in metric tons cereal equivalents, focus area	290,000	351,000	290,000	290,000	to be measured, but above 290.000	ENAB+ PAN PNSEB
Indicator 4: number of farmers with increased production, focus area	0	120,000	0	0	to be measured	Nl funded project reports

Result Question 1.1b: To what extent has your programme contributed to these results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved?	The fertilizer subsidy program PNSEB funded by EKN has contributed to the overall increase. Well over 250,000 farmers benefited from the subsidy fertilizer program and at least 63% of the beneficiaries experienced a net increase in their production. Farmers and cooperatives highlight the benefits of this fertilizers subsidy, but exact quantities are not known. The estimation is a general increase of 15%, but this is particularly true for regions that also received good rains. The percentage attributed directly to the application of fertilizer is difficult to measure. Other activities contributing directly to agricultural production started the second half of 2014. It should be noted that Burundi has two major cropping seasons (A and B) per year. The most predominant is the B. For 2014 Season B saw the insidious early stop of the rains. A recurring phenomenon which is becoming one of the most visible and disturbing issues in production as a consequence of climate change. Fortunately, the good performance of the season A have shown the positive effects of the fertilizer program and could limit the catastrophe expected as a result of the dramatic drop in production recorded in season B.					
	Baseline	**Target 2017**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Indicator 1: percentage of farmers at national level benefiting from the new national fertiliser subsidy program funded by the NL embassy multiplied by production increase as measured by indicator 1.1a - 1, for	0	100,000	0	0	22.000	ENAB + project reports
Indicator 2: percentage of farmers at national level benefiting from the new national fertiliser subsidy program funded by the NL embassy multiplied by number of farmers as measured by indicator 1.1a - 2, for	0	200,000	0	0	25.000	IFDC - PANPNSEB project report
Indicator 3: percentage of aid to agricultural sector projects provided by the NL embassy multiplied by production increase as measured by indicator 1.1a - 3, for focus area (3 provinces) (tons)	0	20,000	0	0	ND	ENAB + project reports
Indicator 4: percentage of aid to agricultural sector projects provided by the NL embassy multiplied by number of farmers as measured by indicator 1.1a - 4, for focus area (3 provinces)	0	40,000	0	0	ND	Project reports

Result Area 1	Increase in sustainable food production					
Result Question 1.2a: How has the use of land, water, energy and labour developed?	Burundi has the most degraded soils in Africa according to a recent study conducted in the framework of a project under NL funding. Faced with this situation agriculture is becoming a default economic activity and men and to a lesser extent women tend to abandon farming. Corrective measurements are badly needed to reverse this situation. EKN will invest in this based on a theory of change exercise held at national level. This will contribute to a more sustainable and more effective increase in food production on the longer-term while the exact correlation between investments and production increase as the return on investment can only be measured after a couple of years. The protection of soil and landscapes against erosion requires an assurance for those who want to invest in it. Land security and certainty was felt as the crucial element that can facilitate such investments contributing to stability and social cohesion as an imperative to guarantee any investments.					
	Baseline	**Target 2017**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Indicator 1: Agricultural productivity in tons (cereal equivalents) per ha per season, country	1.7	2.0	1.7	1.7	1,704	ENAB
Indicator 2: Agricultural productivity in tons (cereal equivalents) per ha per season, focus area (3 provinces)	1.9	2.5	1.9	1.9	1,704	ENAB
Indicator 3: Area of land with permanent erosion control measures (ha)	not available	to be determined			169,576	ENAB
Indicator 4: Area of land under irrigation (ha)	not available	to be determined			n.a for instance	Projects reports (under collaboration with the NL funded projects).

Result Question 1.2b: To what extent has your programme contributed to these results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved?	Producers highly appreciate the availability of quality inputs and learn to mix well organic manure and mineral fertilizers to increase production. They especially appreciate being able to calculate and determine its profit before committing. This proper use of fertilizer and the first steps in a better management of soil have increased production and improved food security at household level initially. Nevertheless, the increasing threats of soil erosion limit the residual effects of fertility application and manure inputs (so far very limited) as they are quickly washed out. This represents a loss of income for those concerned due to the increasing demand of input of fertilizer in the next season. This in a context of very limited financial resources. An urgent focus on the search for a more integrated action to increase the productivity, while reducing recurring financial costs because of erosion and degradation, is required.					
	Baseline	**Target 2017**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Indicator 1: percentage of the new national fertiliser subsidy program funded by the NL embassy multiplied by productivity increase since 2012 as measured by indicator 1.2a - 1, for country (ton/ha)	0	0.10	0	0	0,03	ENAB + project reports
Indicator 2: percentage of aid to agricultural sector projects provided by the NL embassy multiplied by productivity increase since 2012 as measured by indicator 1.2a - 2, for focus area (3 provinces)	0	0.15	0	0	0,02	ENAB + project reports
Indicator 3: Area of land with permanent erosion control measures funded by NL Embassy program (ha)	6,000 (SEW)	to be determined	6,000	6,000	no updated statistics	project reports
Indicator 4: Area of land under irrigation (ha) funded by NL Embassy program	0	to be determined	0	0	idem	project reports

Assessment of results achieved by NL across the entire Result area 1	Increase in sustainable food production
C. Results achieved poorer than planned Reasons for result achieved:	The national fertiliser subsidy program has significantly contributed to increased production and is promising for future results, particularly when embedded in a broarder approach. The formulation of this program has lead to the assessment of the quantitative results to be obtained as presented in this result framework (which were not yet quantified in the MASP 2012-2015). The program triggered other programs and the effective combination and linking of the various on-going and new (PAPAB) programs in the sector are expected to deliver more and more sustainable results. The overall results are less than planned or expected which can to a large part be attributed to the shortfall of rain. Research is required to determine if and to what extend the use of (subsidized) fertilizer has mitigated crop failure and/or losses.
Implications for planning:	Continue as progammed in new MASP 2014-2017 To improve food security in a sustainable way an integrated approach is required adressing current constraints as climate change, degradation/erosion, lack of quality inputs, organizational structures and markets- and value chain linkages. It is well knwon that soil fertility is the most limiting factor in Burundi for increasing agricultural production. Since improved availability of fertilizer will trigger the demand for more production technologies it is expected that the investment in the fertilizer subsidy program is a valuable proxy for agricultural growth. From 2015 onwards the program will be embedded in a broader approach of natural resources, water and soil fertility management to improve its impact and sustainability. A focus on the operationalization of an effective, more integrated action plan to progressively increase agricultural productivity is required. Recurring costs should diminish and more surplusses and better incomes for households should be obtained. For this purpose the planned project PAPAB will come in respons of these needs and opportunities.Many actors will work together in this strategic program, based on a national ToC event which under others highlighted the loss/costs of over 1 billion dollar per year (approximately national GDP) due to soil depletion, erosion and in general natural resource degradation.

Result Area 2	Better access to sufficiently nutritious food					
Result Question 2.1a: How large has the increase in availability of sufficiently nutritious food been?	Malnutrition rate decreased in 3 years from 57.7 to 48.8 at national level. Locally (our focus area) this rate is lower due to intensive interventions. The acute malnutrition rate decreased from 11.27 to 5.4, rewarding the efforts of the GVC (partly funded by EKN). However, the statistics and the way data obtained and interpreted are not very clear and a more comprehensive evaluation is required. Food losses are estimated to be very high (above average in Africa) due to lack of (traditional) adequate storage facilities, weak marketing system and limited processing facilities. Incomes remain very low (lowest in the world) and also reinvestment in farming systems is minimal. Few results are becoming visible in our focus area where land ownership is secured and cooperatives are starting to function (due to external assistance). The school feeding program through WFP contributed strongly to school attendance (more children to school and staying full day), but it is still to early to measure completion rates due to this specific program. With the start of the P4P project a clear improvement in student learning conditions was obtained and pupils now attend the course regularly and diligently. The					
	Baseline	**Target 2017**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Indicator 1: under 5 nutrition status in focus area : % of chronically malnourished children	57	46	57	not measured	48,8	project report GVC
Indicator 2: post harvest losses (percentage) in focus area andable	not measured				to be measured in the future	special research
indicator 3: average farmer household income in focus area (USD)	930	1,070	930	not measured	1102	ENAB + Rapport Evaluation PNSEB
indicator 4: primary school completion rate (%)	51	75	51	68	Figures via Mineduc, BTC or others not yet	Education Ministry and UNICEF

Result Question 2.1b: To what extent has your programme contributed to these results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved?	(1) The FARN project implemented by GVC relies heavily on community based approach and proceeds through sensitization of the population for behavior change in general. It contributed a lot to reduce the acute malnutrition rate from 11.27 to 5.4 and that of chronic malnutrition from 56.8 to 48.8 in the space of two years. This project also collaborated and supported the efforts of REACH SUN movement to introduce kitchen gardens that served as a gateway to these new initiatives. (2) The implementation of PNSEB was very beneficial for farmers. The results of the survey to assess the changes recorded on crop yields and incomes are very satisfactory in only two crop years. Over 63% of the producers concerned show a net increase in their yields. Revenues also increased but to a lesser extent compared to yields (2) It is also obvious that producers hope to obtain better profits from their work by profitting from a functioning market. The lack of market and remunerative prices for surplus discourages the farmers with an increased agricultural production and this is a real constraint for producers who want to come out of subsistence agriculture. By insuring a market and providing capacity building trough training of famers, the P4P implemented by WFP and under funding of our embassy is a good model in pulling production once it focuses on local sourcing. WFP market through the P4P project has generated to date approximately 4.6 billion Burundi francs to cooperative members. By measuring the increase of the					
	Baseline	**Target 2017**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Indicator 1: number of communities having benefited from set up and training of FARNs (100% = 427)	0	427	0	184	202	project report GVC
Indicator 2: number of farmers with increased income through NL funded activities	0	400,000	0		154,350	ENAB+ progress reports PAN PNSEB (Evaluation d'impact)
Indicator 3: Number of pupils having benefited from a daily good school meal (full year)	0	85,000	0	0 (no full year)	47,060	WFP
Indicator 4:Number of local farmers having benefited from selling produce for school meals	0	15,000	0	0 (starts in 2014)	5,438	WFP

Assessment of results achieved by NL across the entire Result area 2	Better access to sufficiently nutritious food
C. Results achieved poorer than planned Reasons for result achieved:	The project provided less results than planned, The achieved results are due to a committed and professional intervention of GVC but could have been better when a more comprehensive approach would have been applied. Also the really bad nutritional status contributed to the fact that quick results were obtained in such circumstances while the favorite policy environment created by the government (SUN-REACH approach) added as well. The attribution of other programs to a better nutrition are difficult to define, but it is estimated that the results are below the expected level. E.g. the increased production due to the fertilizer program has not directly lead to an improved nutritional status because the application was often to a single crop, often being an expected (depending market opportunities) cash crop e.g. rice or maize.
Implications for planning:	Continue execution of program as decribed in MASP 2014-2017. As already forseen in the MASP we expect to obtain more sustainable production results and as such also better nutrition resuls through the newly planned PAPAB (2015 - 2018).

Result Area 3	More efficient markets and an improved business climate					
Result Question 3.1a: Did business activity and trade increase and was it inclusive?	Progress of economic development is very slow in Burundi, and hardly any new investors are interested to invest in Burundi. One of the reasons is the extreme poverty of its population, causing low purchasing power and also continued low productivity in agriculture. Inverting this trend should be done through the agricultural sector, where 90% of the population still earns its living. We could say that business has increased in 2014 according the taxes collected by OBR. In 2014, the taxes collected were 655,7 billions BIF compared to 563,4 billions BIF in 2013. However, corruption is still visible in different services. In 2014 Burundi was ranked in the report "Doing Business" 150th out of 186 countries. Some business indicators have improved. Following examples can reinforce this argument: Starting a Business (20th to 18th). Obtaining building permits (146th to 133rd), Transfer of ownership (51st to 48th), Payment of taxes (126th to 124th) and Trading Across Borders (171st to 169th).					
	Baseline	**Target 2017**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Indicator 1: GDP of Burundi (millions USD)	2,588	3,170	2,588 (growth 4%)	2,685	3,074	Finance Ministry
Indicator 2: Agricultural GDP of Burundi (millions USD)	1,000	1,200	1,000 (growth 4%)	973	1,202	Finance Ministry
indicator 3: Part of Agricultural GDP sold on markets (%)	12	20	12	not included in ENAB	to be measured (not included in ENAB)	ENAB
indicator 4: Number of farmers having obtained agricultural credit (%)	5	10	5	5	to be measured (not included in ENAB)	ENAB

Result Question 3.1b: To what extent has your programme contributed to these results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved?	The Embassy contributed to an improved inclusive business climate focussing on the agriculture sector. The program includes improved access to land, market developement for agricultural inputs (fertiliser and seed) and outputs (value chains) and improved access to agricultural finance. On top of this, a number of ongoing PSI investment projects will lead to results in terms of newly created jobs and income improvement. Several Dutch trade missions visited Burundi in 2014 and investors have shown increasing interest in the potential of the country. The political uncertaincies so far diminished the number of concrete actions taken..					
	Baseline	**Target 2017**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Indicator 1: increased turn over of enterprises supported by NL: PSI, PUM, DGGF etc. (USD)	0	N / A	0		20%	project reports
Indicator 2: newly created jobs through NL supported businesses (PSI, PUM, DGGF etc)	0	N / A	0		50	project reports
indicator 3: number of farmers having obtained land certificates through NL financed land registration services	4,724 of which 4% female	36,990	4,724 of which 4% female	14,990 of which 9% female	----	project reports
Indicator 4: number of farmers with access to rural /agricultural credit due to NL funded support program (compared to 2012)	0	50,000	0	0	to be measured	project reports (MAVC and ABIN began in December 2014. Data will be collected in the 2015 report

Result Area 3	**More efficient markets and an improved business climate**					
Result Question 3.2a: How large has the increase been in international investments and international trade?	The increase in international trade is low because of slow economic growth, whereas international investment are also low and further depressed by unfavorable prospects for future growth. Therefore values of the indicators are very variable and unpredictable. The strong fall of indicator 3 (3.2.a) is due to a shortfall in coffee export and decrease in prices.					
	Baseline	**Target 2017**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
indicator 1: volume of foreign investment (millions USD)	not determined	N/A	0.59	118	97,8	Burundi reserve bank (BRB) reports
indicator 2: volume of export of agricultural commodities (millions USD)	not determined	150	121	43	40,23	Burundi reserve bank (BRB) reports
indicator 3: volume of export of agricultural commodities to the Netherlands (millions USD)	not determined	N/A	1.2	1.14	0,536	Burundi reserve bank (BRB) reports
indicator 4: volume of import of goods from the Netherlands (millions USD)	not determined	N/A	8.2	22.05	15,99	Burundi reserve bank (BRB) reports

Result Question 3.2b: To what extent has your programme contributed to this results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved?	The centrally funded PSI program is contributing to foreign investments from the Netherland. A qualitative output of the Embassy has been, through lobby and technical assistance, the formulation, by the Burundian Government, of a new fertiliser subsidy program which has become operational in 2013, allowing privatisation of fertiliser supply and higher productivity in agriculture, accessible for all smallholders growing food crops.					
	Baseline	**Target 2017**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
indicator 1: volume of investment by Dutch businesses (millions USD)	not determined	N / A	0	45,64	ND	
Indicator 2: volume of foreign investment that has been co-funded by Dutch instruments such as PSI (millions USD)	not determined	N / A	t.b.d.		3,250	PSI funded projects reports
Indicator 3: volume of agricultural export that has been made possible by NL funded value chain development projects or other support (partnership programs, PUM, etc.). (millions USD)	not determined	N / A	0	0	2,371	

Assessment of results achieved by NL across the entire Result area 3	More efficient markets and an improved business climate
C. Results achieved poorer than planned Reasons for result achieved:	The IOB mission of November 2013 recommended additional studies before approving the programmed new projects for agricultural finance (with ICCO-Terrafina) and value chain development (with ICCO and SPARK). This has caused delays in their start. Also the approval of a new seed sector development program (with IFDC) met with delays, leading to approval of all these activities after July 2014. As a consequence, results in 2014 have been fewer than planned. The two projects ICCO-terrafina and SPARK were launched in December 2014. The interim results of implementation will be evaluated and included in reports in 2015. In general the application of Dutch facilitiy instuments became less as compared to previous years. Also the DGGF is probably less equipped for the Burundi situation. The Orio planned projects delayed. Business missions have resulted in much interest, but so far few results mainly due to the political situation and slightly less favorite business climate.
Implications for planning:	A more indepth analysis (comare with TMEA reports) of the results obtained and missed opportunities. Better link our programs, particularly food security, to trade and business opportunities.

bis@minbuza.nl